

REMARKS

Claims 46-61 and 70-78 are pending. Claims 46, 51, 54, 55, 61, 70, 76, and 77 have been amended the claims to more particularly point out the distinctions from the cited references. Claims 50, 52, 53, 59, 60, 74, and 75 have been canceled, without prejudice. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 46-61 and 70-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065732 to Rodgers et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,242 to Keskar et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Rodgers does not disclose each and every element of the claims. Rodgers discloses delivering “content, such as music, literary or dramatic works, films or other moving images” and is limited to such purpose and functionality. See e.g., p. 2 [0021]. Applicants describe a process for distributing and transferring application software, such as executable files, between portable computer systems.

Although, Rodgers discloses “[t]he content management application is also adapted to transmit a copy of itself to the PDA of consumer B upon instruction from consumer A,” this transfer is not in response to a user demarking files and transferring information regarding the demarked files to the second user, wherein the second user may select which files to accept and transfer.

Furthermore, the Examiner cites paragraph [0027] as disclosing “automatically transferring, from the first portable computer system to the second portable computer system.” However, Rodgers is disclosing of the transfer of information from a PDA to a desktop computer, not from a portable computer to another portable computer as claimed. Moreover, Rodgers requires docking the PDA with the desktop to reconcile license data between the systems.

Keskar does not cure Rodgers’ deficiencies. Keskar was cited as disclosing sharing between handheld devices. However, Keskar’s disclosure is generic. Keskar discloses using the “beaming” process of handheld’s to transfer files. For example, the Examiner cites “block P710, the sender, or person wishing to share a relevant item(s), uses the HSA UI to initiate the sending

of the relevant item(s).” Nowhere does Keskar disclose a process of a user selecting applications to allow for transfer, only initiating “beaming” of a file. As such, Rodgers and Keskar, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In the event there are still outstanding issues, the undersigned requests the Examiner to resolve them by telephone in order to expedite allowance of this application. Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: March 9, 2009

By: /Shawn Diedtrich/
Shawn Diedtrich
Registration No. 58,176
Direct: 480.704.4615

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860